DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 792 LI 004 514

AUTHOR Gherman, Paul; And Others
TITLE Faculty Loan Regulations in ARL Academic Libraries. Technical Paper No. 4.
INSTITUTION Wayne State Univ., Detroit, Mich. Univ. Libraries.
PUB DATE May 73
NOTE 9p.; (1 reference)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Faculty; Library Associations; *Library Circulation; Library Collections; Library Surveys; Policy; Questionnaires; *University Libraries
IDENTIFIERS Association of Research Libraries; *Library Loan Regulations

ABSTRACT

A survey of faculty loan regulations in force at Association of Research Libraries (ARL) academic libraries indicated that there is little equity, between faculty and students, of loan regulations; that it is not possible to determine loan policies from the regulations that support policy; and that many of the libraries appear to be unable to force compliance with faculty loan regulations. (Author/SJ)

ED 082792

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

DETROIT 2, MICHIGAN

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

TECHNICAL PAPER NO.4

Faculty Loan Regulations in ARL Academic Libraries

by

Paul Gherman

Gladys Hogland

Carolyn Navarre

May, 1973

LI 004 514

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ABSTRACT

A survey of faculty loan regulations in force at ARL academic libraries indicated that there is little equity, between faculty and students, of loan regulations; that it is not possible to determine loan policies from the regulations that support policy; and that many of the libraries appear to be unable to force compliance with faculty loan regulations.

In 1972, the authors--as members of the Library Fines Committee of the Wayne State University Libraries--were given the charge of recommending changes in the existing fines system. Two areas of difficulty were apparent in regard to faculty loan control: (1) the extent to which the Library should attempt to increase equity of loan regulations between faculty and students, and (2) the means by which the Library should attempt to enforce faculty compliance with Library loan regulations. It was realized through contact with students that there is a growing demand by students for equity between student and faculty groups. And it was found that there is currently little compliance, on the part of faculty, with regulations governing loan periods, loan renewal, and payment for lost or long-overdue Library materials.[1]

In order to determine how other libraries are dealing with these problems, a questionnaire was designed to determine current regulations in the area of faculty loans, sanctions, and equity with students (Addendum 1). The questionnaire was sent to all ARL (Association of Research Libraries) academic libraries. Of the seventy-nine institutions polled,[2] seventy-eight responded--which is indicative of the keen interest in this problem.

A tabulation of the responses to the questionnaire will be found in Table 1. In some instances, the total number of responses is greater than the number of libraries polled because more than one blank was checked by the respondents. While many informal statements were attached to the questionnaires, they are not reported here. However, these statements generally indicated that written regulations were sometimes--or were frequently--not observed in practice.

It was expected that the responses would indicate a movement toward greater equity between faculty and students and toward stringent enforcement of faculty loan regulations. It was presumed that it would be possible to determine over all faculty loan policies from the regulations that support policy. And it was thought that variations in loan policies might be partially attributable to the institutions' geographic location, size, and source of funding (whether publicly or privately supported). None of these assumptions were supported by the responses received.

This study covers only current practice and treats neither historical development of faculty regulations nor planned (or hoped-for) changes. Information concerning development of current policies would have been useful in determining trends. However, the study should provide historical perspective for future studies. A number of respondents did make peripheral remarks indicating that they were contemplating changes in their present regulations. As stated above, such informal remarks will not be reported.

Length of loan allowed faculty is not in itself an indicator of student-faculty equity. It may, however, be an important indicator of policy when considered with other loan regulations. While many of the answers concerning the length of loan differed in wording, they have been tabulated as follows:

One month or less	13
One semester or comparable time	27
Six months	5
One year (academic or calendar)	22
Indefinite	10
No answer	1

It is obvious from the long loan periods that most faculty loans are geared to the academic calendar and are designed to facilitate teaching and research. Of the thirteen institutions having a loan period of one month or less, seven had established equity of loan for students and faculty. Of these seven, five indicated that they do not require physical return of the book for renewal.

Whether or not the length of loan was equal for faculty and students was considered to be one of the key factors in determining library attitudes toward equity. When the thirteen libraries reporting that their loan periods were the same for faculty and students were compared for size of enrollment, geographic location, and whether or not they are state supported, no significant correlation to any of these variables was found.

Whether or not faculty were charged library fines was also felt to be an indication of student-faculty equity. Of the thirteen libraries in which length of loan is the same for students and faculty, only four charge faculty with daily fines. Thus it would seem that equity of loan period is more apparent than real except in those libraries that fine neither faculty nor students (statistic not available).

The latitude given in renewal of books was seen as a measure of one facet of library control over faculty loan. Because a large number of libraries do require the physical presence of the book for renewal (in some cases because an automated system requires the book card for recharging), library control in this area seems strong. This may, however, be illusory. If the faculty member has an extended loan period with no means of enforcing return, the rigid renewal policy is meaningless.

All but one library indicated that they attempt to recall materials charged to faculty if the materials are requested by another library user. Because the questionnaire did not specifically ask for all means employed to insure return of recalled items, this data is useless as an indicator of policy. The authors assumed that those libraries that disclose faculty borrower's names to the academic community depend on peer pressure for the return of requested library materials while those libraries that never disclose names of borrowers depend on library clout for the return of materials. Also it was assumed that the size of the institution as well as the library's means of enforcing payment of fines or payment for lost or long-overdue books might influence response. However, there was no significant correlation between nondisclosure and these factors. (The WSU Library's policy of nondisclosure was instituted in response to law enforcement agencies seeking access to circulation records. It is not known whether there was similar motivation at other institutions.)

No significant correlation was found to exist between the fact that a library sends overdue notices to faculty and any other factor in the questionnaire or to any specific type of university. And no relationship could be found between the number of overdue notices sent and any other facet of loan control.

Whether or not a library charged faculty overdue fines was considered one of the more important indicators of the library's ability to enforce length of loan regulations. When the fifteen positive responses were compared to the method of enforcement of library regulations, they were distributed as follows:

Deduct from pay	4
Not enforced	3
Contact departments or deans	5
Refer account to collection agency	1
Cancel borrowing privileges	1
Not enforced	1

There is a high correlation between fining faculty and a strict means of enforcing payment. Only three institutions fining faculty did not enforce fines in some way. And nine of these institutions renew loans only in person or in writing. Sixty-three libraries bill faculty for lost and overdue materials and fifteen do not. All of the fifteen libraries that charge faculty with daily fines also bill faculty. Of the fifteen libraries that do not charge faculty fines and do not bill faculty, fourteen require that loans be renewed. Ten of these libraries disclose names of faculty borrowers. It is not known how the other five enforce return of overdue materials and renewal of loans (all require renewal).

It was felt that the means of insuring the payment of library charges and the return of library materials was most important as a measure of a library's ability to enforce faculty compliance with loan regulations. Seventeen libraries do not attempt to enforce payment of library charges. Fifteen do not levy charges against faculty. And nineteen rely on others within the university to influence faculty to pay library charges. (Thirteen contact the faculty member's department; four refer the account to a university business office; and two refer the account to the dean's office.) It is not known how effective these other agencies are in influencing payment or what actions they take. (Presumably these university business offices do not submit accounts to collection agencies or deduct from pay.) It appears that only eighteen libraries are quite certain to collect library charges from faculty--those that cancel borrowing privileges, submit to collection agencies, deduct from pay, or charge the faculty member's department. There was no significant correlation between strict enforcement of payment and geographic location, size of institution, or whether publicly or privately supported.

While this study is modest in scope, it points to the difficulty of establishing policy in an open system such as a major research library. The research library must respond to internal and external pressures that may or may not support the goals of the institution as a whole. The fact that the responses to key questions had little predictive value (i.e., it was not possible to predict what response would be to questions based on the responses to other questions) suggests that the libraries polled do not have clear-cut goal-oriented loan policies. For example, one might suppose that when a library imposes a relatively short loan period, that applies both to faculty and students, that this regulation suggests a policy of providing the greatest access to library-owned materials to the greatest number of library users. However, when this regulation is

coupled with conflicting regulations (such as charging daily fines only to students), it is clear that either a single goal or purpose is not reflected in the regulations or that the goal is sufficiently complex so that it cannot easily be deduced from the regulations supporting it. Some loan regulations may have been adopted in a piecemeal fashion without regard to policy. Some may have been altered in response to faculty or student pressures. Some regulations may exist because of institution-wide practices (such as the practice of deducting all university-indebtedness from pay). While it is possible to indicate apparent lack of consistency in regulations from this survey, it is not possible to assign reasons for such inconsistencies. However, it appears that until libraries establish clearly stated policies, that are accepted as necessary for the achievement of institutional goals, that libraries will continue to make frequent ad hoc changes in their regulations (as attested to by the many informal remarks appended to the returned questionnaires stating that written regulations were frequently not observed). And until libraries establish such policies and develop regulations consistent with these policies, they will very likely continue to be unable to enforce their regulations.

---

1. See Report of the Library Fines Committee. Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, University Libraries, October, 1972 (ED 068 100).

2. Includes John Crerar Library.

ADDENDUM I
QUESTIONNAIRE

What is the length of loan allowed faculty members? _____

Is the length of loan the same for faculty and students?
Yes ____ No ____

How may faculty renew a loan?
____ In person
____ Over telephone
____ In writing
____ All of above
____ Not renewable

Do you attempt to recall items charged to faculty if there is a request for that item?
Yes ____ No ____ Only if requested by faculty ____

Do you disclose the names of faculty borrowers who have charged out materials needed by students or other faculty?
Never ____ To students ____ To other faculty ____

Are overdue notices sent to faculty?
Yes ____ No ____

If "yes", how many notices are sent? _____

Are faculty borrowers charged daily fines for overdue materials?
Yes ____ No ____

Are faculty billed for long overdue or lost library materials?
Yes ____ No ____

How do you enforce the payment of library charges owed by faculty?
Cancel borrowing privileges ____
Submit to collection agency ____
Contact their department ____
Deduct from paycheck ____
Other ____
Not enforced ____

If "other", please explain on the back of this sheet.

TABLE 1
TABULATION OF RESPONSES

Category	Frequency	Percent
Faculty loan period		
Less than or equal to one month	13	16.6
One semester or comparable period	27	34.6
Six months	5	6.4
One year (academic or calendar)	22	28.2
Indefinite	10	12.8
No response	1	1.3
Equity of loan period		
Same loan period for faculty and students	13	16.6
Different loan period for faculty and students	65	83.3
No response	0	----
Faculty loan renewal		
In person	49	62.8
Over telephone	3	3.8
In writing	12	15.4
All of above	22	28.2
Not renewable	1	1.3
No response	4	5.1
Faculty recall		
Attempt to recall from faculty	77	98.7
Do not attempt to recall from faculty	1	1.3
Attempt to recall only if requested by faculty	0	----
No response	0	----
Disclosure		
Never disclose names of faculty borrowers	32	40.0
Disclose names of faculty borrowers to students	34	43.6
Disclose names of faculty borrowers to faculty	45	57.7
No response	0	----
Overdue notices		
Overdue notices sent to faculty	66	84.6
Overdue notices not sent to faculty	12	15.4
No response	0	----
Number of overdue notices		
Answers unusable because some respondents included phone calls, letters, etc. while others included only standard overdue notices.		
Faculty fines		
Faculty charged daily fines	15	19.2
Faculty not charged daily fines	63	80.8
No response	0	----

TABLE 1 CONT.

Billing		
Faculty billed for long-overdue or lost materials	63	80.8
Faculty not billed for long-overdue or lost materials	15	19.2
No response	0	----
Enforcement		
Cancel borrowing privileges	4	5.1
Submit to collection agency	3	3.8
Contact faculty members' department	13	16.6
Deduct from faculty pay	10	12.8
Charge faculty members' department	1	1.3
Refer to university business office	4	5.1
Report to dean or president	2	2.6
Other (not specified)	8	10.3
Not enforced	17	21.8
Not applicable (faculty not fined or billed)	15	19.2
No response	0	----